DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 122 EC 132 548

AUTHOR Peterson, Reece L.; And Others
TITLE Practices Used in the Reintegration of Behavior Disordered Children in Three Midwestern States.
PUB DATE 15 Aug 80
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children National Topical Conference on Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (Minneapolis, MN, August 13-15, 1980). Print is marginal and may not reproduce well.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; *Mainstreaming; *Student Placement; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Survey responses from 683 teachers of emotionally disturbed (ED) students were analyzed to determine actual practices used by special educators of self contained and resource classrooms to integrate behavior disordered students into regular classes in Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. Results are detailed for such aspects as the following: certification and experience of teachers, program role, number of ED students served by type of program, time spent per week in various categories of activities, type and usefulness of information available at time of placement, types and usefulness of information at time of reintegration, and most important factors in choosing a site for reintegration. Implications are noted for distinctions between types of ED children (conduct disorders vs. clinical personality disorders), training needs of teachers responsible for reintegration, and followup procedures for reintegration. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201122

Practices Used in the Reintegration of Behavior Disordered Children in Three Midwestern States

August 15, 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C.E.C. National Topical Conference on Seriously Emotionally Disturbed

Minneapolis, Minnesota

August 13-15, 1980

Reece L. Peterson
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583
(402) 472-3955

Maureen A. White
A.E.A. #7
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
(319) 235-1382

Carl R. Smith
Iowa Dept. of Public Instr.
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-3176

Robert H. Zabel
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66502
(913) 532-5843

EC132548

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Reece L. Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Overview

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to better understand how behavior disordered students are presently being integrated into regular school programs.

Procedure

A survey of all teachers of behavior disordered children and a sample of special education resource teachers in Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska was conducted during the winter of 1980. The survey questionnaire sought information on the numbers and types of students reintegrated, procedures used for identification, programming, and reintegration, and a variety of other related topics. See Appendix A.

Survey Population

Mailing labels from the state departments of education in the respective states were obtained for teachers of behavior disordered (emotionally disturbed) and for special educators in resource teacher roles. Questionnaires were mailed in January of 1980 to all teachers of behavior disordered youngsters and to a random sample of approximately 50% of the special education resource teachers. Table 1 (page 20) shows the size of the survey population and respondent samples. An overall return rate of 54.3% was obtained for the survey. Tables 2 to 7 show the distribution of respondents by State, grade level, and type of program.

Results of the Study

The data collected as a part of this study are large in quantity and are complex. Much of the data are incorporated into the tables which are attached (Tables 8-31). A series of analyses of components of these data are expected to be submitted for publication later.

Further Information

For further information about the study and for references to analyses of study data (as they become available), please contact any of the four individuals on the cover sheet of this booklet.

Practices Used in the Reintegration of Behavior Disordered Children in Three Midwestern States

Since the passage of P. L. 94-142 and related policies which mandated the education of handicapped children in the "least restrictive alternative" (LRA) environment, much attention has been focused on the need to integrate handicapped youngsters into "regular" education programs. Implementation of this policy is an important objective of programs for behavior disordered (BD) youngsters (Grosenick, 1970).

As a result of the LRA policy, a great amount of activity is taking place to encourage and prepare regular and special educators for the integration process. Pressure is on schools and teachers to actually accomplish integration. Service delivery models have been proposed to facilitate mainstreaming (Deno, 1970). Various training programs have been instituted, both inservice and preservice (Smith, 1977), relating to the integration of handicapped children into regular programs. Goals and desirable practices for integration have been identified (Reynolds, 1973). Model programs have been established and disseminated (Deno, 1979) for mainstreaming. In short, much activity has occurred.

The Need for Information

Unfortunately, however, very little is known about the current status of integration as it is being actually accomplished in the public schools. Virtually no studies have examined the integration of behavior disordered children specifically. Little is known about the amount of integration which is currently taking place. Little is known about how responsibility is assigned for initiating and following-up integration in the schools.

Little is known about the criteria used to determine the readiness of a youngster for integration, or to determine the site for that integration. (One recent study by Wilkes, Bireley, & Schultz, 1979, addresses this topic for learning disabled children.) Little is known about the preparation provided to the child or to the teacher before integration occurs.

Survey Procedure

In order to address these areas of need for information, a study has been undertaken by the participants in this presentation to obtain information about the actual practices used by special educators to integrate behavior disordered youngsters into regular programs. The study consisted of a survey mailed in February, 1980, to a 50% sample of special education resource teacher programs and all self-contained classrooms for emotionally disabled children in the states of Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska during February of 1980. The purpose of the survey was to obtain a range of data relating to the process of integration of behavior disordered youngsters in the public schools of these three states.

This current study is an outgrowth of an earlier, similar survey of special class teachers of the emotionally disabled in Iowa (Smith, White, & Peterson, 1979) which had a narrower scope. This earlier study has acted as a pilot for the present study.

The data which were collected were analyzed using the computation facilities at the University of Nebraska to obtain descriptive statistics and to obtain statistical tests of the relationships among some of the variables of concern.

Survey Respondents

The first table (Table 1) describes the survey sample and respondents. The return rate was very good, in that 54.3% of all of those survey forms mailed were returned. These respondents are the source of the data which were analyzed.

A copy of the survey instrument is attached as Appendix A. Two quick observations about the Survey Form should be made. First of all, it was more than five pages long, was rather complicated, and thus was difficult to complete. One of the things that we found gratifying was the significant response rate to the survey, in spite of the fact that it was a very difficult and time-consuming task. That seems to demonstrate the importance of the topics that were incorporated into the survey, and the interest the responding teachers had in these topics.

Limitation of the Study

There are a couple of cautions related to the study, however. The data are self-report data and as such are subject to some caution in interpretation. Specific instances will be noted later, but some teachers reported seemingly unfeasible information. We are not sure whether they misinterpreted the question or whether they intended to say what they did. For example, one teacher indicated that she worked 120 hours per week, which seems to be rather improbable. Since we are dealing with self-report data, what the teachers reported may not be what is actually occurring. All that we know is what these teachers say is occurring.

Secondly, the number of respondents we have is very significant.

Confidence in our conclusions is high because of the size of our sample, 683 teachers. These teachers were of two types, teachers with self-contained classrooms, and resource teachers who work with ED children. While special education resource teachers were surveyed, we really only expected and only analyzed responses from those special education resource teachers who had an emotionally disturbed youngster in their caseload. The form was designed in such a way that those who did not have emotionally disturbed youngsters completed only the first section of the survey and their data essentially was omitted. We are dealing, therefore, with resource teachers who had emotionally disturbed youngsters in their caseload, and our conclusion shall be limited to that group.

The survey form was developed based on our best judgment. While it was based on a form from a pilot study in Iowa that preceded the version here, nevertheless, there may have been some very important things which were not included in the survey form. Our presentation simply reflects the kinds of questions we asked. It is a matter of opinion as to whether there may have been other questions that would have been as important, but which were not asked by our survey. An awareness of some of these cautions in interpreting the results of the survey is important.

Results of the Study

Next, what I would like to do is scan the results of the survey as presented on the tables. Please refer to Tables 2, 3, and 4 for

information relating to the responding teachers' home state, the level of program, and the type of program.

On Table 2, you will see that Iowa and Kansas had the largest number of respondents. This, possibly, reflects the population and the differences in numbers of programs in the states, although we have not calculated that to be sure. Interestingly enough, there was quite a significant sample of secondary teachers which is somewhat unusual. The "other" category of grade level likely consisted of combinations of both elementary and secondary, especially in rural areas where one teacher had a caseload that included ages which crossed the elementary/secondary boundary.

Table 4 shows that the number of respondents in resource rooms and self-contained programs were virtually equally balanced. Fewer respondents were in residential programs. It is most interesting and quite a coincidence that we had exactly the same number of resource teacher respondents as we did self-contained classroom teacher respondents. We also had respondents from some residential programs, and even though that number is small, it appears to be a substantial number for this type of survey. We intend to do a comparison between resource and self-contained programs later. Data for this comparison are currently being analyzed, and it is expected that even more information will be accumulated.

Another significant aspect of the study is the certification status of respondents. Table 8 shows the certification status of the teachers who responded. A large percentage of resource teachers indicated that

they were fully certified to teach emotionally disturbed children. Since certification policies vary somewhat among the three states, it may be difficult to interpret exactly what these results about certification mean across the three states. At any rate, most resource teachers did feel that they were qualified in terms of credentials to teach ED children, which seems very interesting. It may also be interesting that there was such a large percentage of teachers in all categories who did not have certification for emotionally disturbed. That may show us that we are a young field and we are in need of qualified trained teachers; and that positions are being filled with people who may not have credentials for working with these youngsters.

The experience of the respondents, shown on Table 9, may also be of interest. Two questions addressed the amount of experience the respondents had. First, the number of full years of teaching experience of all types was generally much less than ten years. Most teachers had around five years (the median of 4.7 may be the best statistic here) of overall experience. While the number of years of experience is not extensive, we do have a considerable number of experienced teachers However, when the number of years of experience teaching emotionally disturbed youngsters was requested, the number of years dropped significantly. The median here was just over two years. The respondents are teachers who have rather limited experience in programs for emotionally disturbed youngsters. They are likely newly trained in ED and have some, but not an exceptional amount, of other teaching experience. One

exception was one person who indicated that he or she had 61 years of total experience! For many of the rest of us it may must seem like it had been that long!

Later we will be discussing in more detail the distinction that was made between Type I and Type II ED youngsters. See Tables 10, 11, and 12. On the survey we asked the teachers to discriminate between the number of Type I and Type II ED youngsters served and to provide a total. You can see the total of the two types doesn't add up and that is because these are the figures that the respondents reported to us. (It is inappropriate to be critical because the form is very complicated and very likely the totals wouldn't add up, although theoretically they should.) The survey respondents indicated that they served about 5,127 emotionally disturbed youngsters. This seems a tremendous number. The definitions that we used for Type I and Type II are on the survey form in the Appendix. Essentially, Type I are youngsters with school behavior problems, while Type II are youngsters who are considered truly emotionally disturbed and have clinical symptoms. It is interesting that there is a substantial number of each of the two types of youngsters (see Table 10) in resource, self-contained, and residential programs. As might have been expected, resource programs were much more heavily loaded with Type I youngsters. On the other hand, self-contained classes were more heavily loaded with Type II children, although the difference was small. Surprisingly, residential programs were roughly balanced in the types of youngsters they served, with slightly more Type I than Type II students indicated.

Also, the states (Table 11) are generally balanced (except for Kansas) in the two types. The total sample of youngsters from the various states is probably somewhat proportional to the number of programs in operation, except for Kansas, which had a fewer number of teachers than Iowa, but had far more kids. That means Kansas had a higher caseload per teacher than the other states. Table 12 shows a breakdown in terms of elementary-secondary. Type I behavior problem youngsters are more heavily identified at the secondary level, while more Type II, truly emotionally disturbed youngsters, are identified at the elementary level. There is a rough balance between the two types, with approximately the same number Type I and Type II, at the elementary level.

Table 13 shows the number of hours spent by respondents per week in various categories of activities. The mean was about 48 hours per week, the median about 45 hours. Anything that was over 99 hours per week was assumed to be an error and was not included in analysis. Of the total hours spent, a considerable amount, more than half, was involved in direct instruction. Preparation and planning, including record keeping and so on, seems to be taking about nine hours a week or roughly 20% of teachers' time. The most interesting category, however, is that of consultation and indirect support services, which seems very low. About 3.7 hours per week or less than 10% of the teacher's time is spent in "indirect service-consultation" activities. It should be noted that virtually all the teachers in this sample have youngsters who are integrated into regular programs. One problem that these data begin

to point out is that teachers may not be spending the time necessary for those activities which support successful integration. If the indirect support to the student through consultation with the classroom teacher is an important activity, teachers aren't spending very much time on it relative to other activities.

Next, referring to Tables 14 and 15, the types of information that are available in placement and reintegration-decision making were surveyed. Two questions were asked, whether information is available (yes or no), and the usefulness of that information on a scale of 1 to 7 in making placement and reintegration decisions.

IQ scores and reports, standardized achievement test scores, and clinical psychologist reports are the most available at time of placement. IQ scores and standardized achievement tests are the least useful of all of the types of information listed. In order on Table 15, the most useful kinds of information were the statement of students' goals or objectives, clinical psychological reports, intervention techniques already attempted, and assessment of behavioral status/anecdotal records. Formal behavior observation data was highly rated in the usefulness but second to the last in availability. IQ scores and reports were rated low in their usefulness. Target dates and subjective evaluations were deemed least useful.

On Tables 17 and 18, the same sets of information will be examined but for a different purpose. These tables examine the availability and the usefulness of the same information concerned with getting ED students reintegrated back into a regular program. In terms of availability of information, results were similar to that in Table 14. At

the time of a reintegration decision, the same things that were available before, remain available. If anything, the general availability of information has increased with most types above 80% in availability. The only ones that were generally not available were the last three or four. Description of regular class expectations/requirements, formal observation data, behavior ratings/checklists, and sociometric/self-concept data were fairly unavailable. The number one ranked type of information for availability (achievement of behavioral/academic goals) is also the number one ranked in usefulness. IQ scores data are available but not very useful. Teacher's assessment of behavioral status is high in both cases, and there are a few that are rather low in both cases, not available, and not so useful, including target dates for achievement of goals, and health history and family information. Table 18 summarizes in rank order the same usefulness analysis as just discussed. Again it is obvious that the types of information that are most useful are up here, the least useful down. Between the highly ranked items and the low ranked items there is a fairly significant spread since this was a 1 to 7 rating scale. There are detections of some differences, especially where gross differences in means occur.

Teachers were asked if there was a choice of integration sites for the youngsters with which they worked. Their responses are on Table 21. Surprisingly, many teachers did have choices of sites for reintegration. Overall 74% did, versus 26% who did not. Table 21 shows a breakdown by state, program and level. Resource teachers had many choices, as did self-contained teachers.

The next question that was asked had to do with factors in choosing a site for integration. See Tables 22, 23, and 24. We had two types of factors on the form, teacher factors and classroom factors. Some factors had more to do with the teacher and others more with the classroom. Attitude was high among the teacher-related factors. Among the things that were very low was "training" of the classroom teacher. Training, in terms of usefulness, did not make much difference in the choice of a teacher as a site for reintegration. "Training" was viewed as being a less useful criteria than all the other factors listed.

Classroom factors are on Table 23. Among classroom factors the degree of classroom structure was important, as was the level of materials and the range of student behaviors. Factors such as location and convenience were less important as was the availability of aides. Class size was fourth in the middle range of importance.

Table 24 combines teacher and classroom factors from most important to the least important. The top four here are "teacher factors" not the "classroom factors." Most of the teacher factors were most important than the classroom factors when combined. Apparently in reintegrating, special educators are more interested in the teachers characteristics than they are in the classroom characteristics.

Respondents were asked, on Table 29, to indicate which of these things was most important to the integration decision: academic progress, behavioral progress in the special education program, or behavioral progress outside of the special education program. Academic progress

was most important for 9% and least important for 57% of respondents. Behavioral progress in the special education program was quite important, while behavior outside the special education program was still more important than academic progress.

This completes a general overview of the results of the entire study. Rather than attempting to digest all of the results fully, two topics will be reviewed in more detail, the characteristics of ED children and the preparation for reintegration of ED children.

Three things will be discussed in this section, characteristics of behavior disordered, possible policy and program implication regarding characteristics of these youngsters, and finally, results of the present study regarding special education teachers' perceptions of the characteristics of these students.

Subgroups of ED Children

Historically, there have been a number of studies relating to the characteristics of emotionally disturbed youngsters as far back as the 1940's. These studies have resulted in various type of configurations of factors. Hewitt and Jenkins (1946) talked about unsocialized aggressive and socialized aggressive characteristics. Quay, Mores, and Cutler (1966), in the mid-60's, looked at kids in public school classes and classified youngsters as having conduct disorders (agressive acting out behavior) as opposed to other categories such as personality problems and other clinical characteristics.

More recently Algozzine, Schmid & Connors (1978) speculated that there are two types of kids in ED programs: regular ED (Type I) and clinical (Type II).

They described a clinical type of youngsters, Type II, as a youngster who shows the deviant behavior in many different settings - at school, at home, etc. This child doesn't seem to be readily responsive to behavioral management strategies. Also, there is some feeling that there is perhaps some organic problem in Type II children. This is opposed to Type I children who are "regular ED," or nonclinical, and who do appear to respond to management strategies. Type I children do not necessarily show the same behaviors across various settings, at home, at school, etc., as in the case with Type II children.

Implications of Distinguishing Subgroups

These distinctions between types of ED children are important for several reasons. There has been an assumption that all ED children are clinically involved, which is an assumption that's not been verified in research. In some cases there is a potential for an inappropriate programming for the behaviorally disordered youngster because it was based on the incorrect perception that an ED program deals only with the really clinically involved youngster.

There's another implication. There is a false impression that there are not that many pupils who are handicapped in the ED area. Obviously when looking at the clinical population portion, there aren't that many. However, there are a large number of pupils, who are behaviorally disordered and need special education programs; and they tend to be overlooked.

Finally, there is the issue of prognosis. Prognosis has been addressed, for the more severely involved kids, in studies such as that

reported by Lee Robins (1979). She has pointed out that the prognosis for the more clinically involved kids is not very good. People are assuming that all of these ED kids are included in that group. This seems to be in comparison to behaviorally disordered youngsters whose behavior may be more readily changed and whose prognosis may be better.

Results of the Current Study

Referring to Table 10, the teachers were asked to list the number of students that they consider primarily behaviorally disordered vs. those they consider truly emotionally disturbed. More students were identified as behaviorally disordered by these teachers than were identified as being truly emotionally disturbed. This is just a crude beginning as to teacher's perceptions of student characteristics. Table 11 provides an analysis across the states. Kansas teachers indicate that they have more Type II ED students than Type I. There is a closer relationship between the two types of ED students in Iowa and Nebraska. The last table dealing with characteristics, Table 11, shows the breakdown by Type of ED student and by elementary and secondary levels. It confirms that basically at each level, elementary through secondary, there were more youngsters who were identified as behavior disordered Type I than identified as truly ED, Type II.

Preparation for Reintegration

The next section emphasizes the training of teachers for reintegration of ED students, responsibilities in the integration process, procedures that are being used, and the follow-up procedures.

Training for Reintegration

Table 26 shows training of teachers involved in the reintegration process. Teachers were asked to indicate to the best of their knowledge how much training had been provided to the building staff regarding the reintegration of students. Similar questions targeted specifically the training of the classroom teachers who are going to be working with students from the ED/BD class, and the special class teachers themselves. Special classroom teachers were also asked to list the training in the area of consultation that they had received. It was assumed that these are skills that you would need to be a success in reintegrating special students. No attempt was made to define "a session." It is apparent that over 50% of the classroom teachers are receiving no training at all. Only about 25% of teachers who are working with ED students have received any training whatsoever. It appears that what is occurring is that the students are brought to the teacher and very little training and support is provided. Judging from the flood of the material regarding mainstreaming that has been available the last few years since P.L. 94-142, it appears that publishers, institutions of higher education, and others who provide inservice are concluding that training is important if not profitable. There has been a great expense involved in providing so many packaged training programs but, according to the survey, teachers in Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa relate training as a low priority as far as selecting the teacher who would be receiving integrated students. For instance, training was ranked No. 13 of 13 considerations on Table 22. In selecting a site (Table 24) again teacher's training was 20 of 22 in order of importance. When teachers were asked to choose the most important factors

(Table 25) again, teacher training was low.

The "training" was not defined. It could be an inservice provided by a teacher or a school district, or just a teacher providing information, or it could be a complete university course. There are some possible explanations for the fact that the training was a low priority. One of them might be that there's no training available. Another might be that the usefulness of training for teachers has been down-played, or; it could be that regular classroom teachers don't feel that they have a need for this training until they know that they're going to be getting ED or BD students. It was interesting that so little emphasis was put on this training, when inservice training has become so important nationally; it's even required in P.L. 94-142 that training should be provided to classroom teachers.

Looking at the bottom part of Table 26, teachers were asked about the training that they had received, either in reintegrating kids (the kind of a session concerned with processes, etc.), or the training they've received in providing consultation to other teachers. It appears special educators are better trained than regular teachers--72.9% of the special teachers indicated that they had received training in reintegration and 65.2% indicated they had received training in consultation techniques. It appears that the training is directed toward special educators, rather than regular educators. A good share of that can be explained because special education personnel have a more immediate need for the training.

Responsibility for Reintegration

Table 27 deals with responsibilities in the area of reintegration. The respondents were to indicate the person who had main responsibility assigned in the reintegration process. 76.4% indicated that the responsibility was assigned to the respondent. 52.4% indicated complete responsibility was assigned to them. It's the special educator in most instances who has the responsibility for initiating the decisions deciding whether the student is ready to be reintegrated, going through all the procedural aspects, preparing the classroom teacher, etc. Referring to different areas of responsibility and the time spent on them, we can see that the teachers are putting in extra hours as a result of added responsibility.

Procedures for Reintegration

Procedural aspects of reintegration (Table 28) was one aspect of an Iowa study that was done two years ago. Very few people were found then who had written procedures, very few had even discussed it or had any idea what the procedures were. Table 28 indicates better results. 27% indicated they had written procedures, 45% indicated that even though there weren't formally written procedures, everybody understood them. Only 27% indicated they had not established any procedures at all.

Follow-up of Reintegration

Table 31 refers to follow-up procedures. Most people (93%) rely on verbal reports. 57% relied on a checklist of some sort. Frequency of

follow-up in most cases was weekly. There was no differentiation between students integrated part time and those full time.

For more information about these topics and for suggested strategies for facilitating the reintegration of ED students into regular program, you are referred to a publication by White (1980). It was written for teachers of ED students to suggest guidelines and practices which would be helpful in placing, managing, and evaluating the reintegration of ED students.

References

Algozzine, B., Schmidt, R., and Connors, B. Toward an acceptable definition of emotional disturbance. Behavior Disorders.

Ashenbach, T. & Edelbrock, C. The classification of child psychopathology: A review and analysis of empirical efforts. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 1275-1301.

Deno, E. Educating children with emotional, learning, and behavior problems. Reston, VA: C.E.C., 1978.

Deno, E. Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, VA: C.E.C., 1970.

Grosenick, J. Assessing the reintegration of exceptional children into regular classes. Teaching Exceptional Children, Spring, 1970, 2, 113-119.

Grosenick, J. K. & Huntze, S. L. National needs analysis in behavior disorders: A model for a comprehensive needs analysis in behavior disorders. Columbia, MO: Department of Special Education.

Hewitt, L. E. & Jenkins, R. L. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: The dynamics of their origins. Springfield, IL: State of Illinois, 1946.

Quay, H., Morse, W. & Cutler, R. Personality patterns of pupils in special classes for the emotionally disturbed. Exceptional Children, 1966, 32, 297-301.

Reynolds, M. C. & Birch, J. Educating exceptional children in all America's schools. Reston, VA: C.E.C., 1977.

Robins, L., in H. Quay and J. Werry Psychopathological Disorders of Children. NY: Wiley, 1979.

Smith, C., White, M. & Peterson, R. Iowa study of the reintegration of emotionally disabled pupils: Preliminary report. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 1979.

Smith, J. (Ed.). The map, the mission, and the mandate. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.O.E., 1977.

White, M. Facilitating the reintegration of emotionally disabled students. Unpublished paper, 1980.

Wilkes, H., Bireley, M. & Schultz, J. Criterion for mainstreaming the learning disabled child into the regular classroom. Journal of Learning Disabilities. April, 1979, 12 (4), 46-51.

Three State ED Survey

Table 1

Survey Population and Respondents

Survey Population	Number Mailed	Valid Respondents	Percent of Population
Teachers of Emotionally Disturbed	699	404	56.5
Special Education Resource and Related Personnel	638	279	45.1
Deletions for Incorrect Address, Errors, etc.	51		
Total	1256	683	54.3

Three State ED Survey

Table 2
Survey Respondents by State

State	N	%
Iowa	326	47.7
Kansas	221	32.4
Nebraska	124	18.2
Missing	12	1.8
Total	683	100.0

Table 3
Grade Level of Survey Respondents

Grade	N	%
Elementary	293	42.9
Secondary	266	38.9
Other	120	17.6
Missing	4	0.6
Total	683	100.0

Table 4
Type of Program Role of Survey Respondents

Role	N	%
Resource Program	274	40.1
Self-Contained Classroom	274	40.1
Residential Program	41	6.0
Other	94	13.8
Total	683	100.0

Three State ED Survey

Table 5

Cross Tabulation of Level of Service Provided by State

	Percentage of Respondents			Total*	
	Resource	Self-Contained	Residential	Percentage	Number
Iowa	52.0	46.7	4.7	100	296
Kansas	43.9	41.6	14.5	100	173
Nebraska	36.7	61.7	1.7	100	120
Total	46.5	46.5	7.0	100	589

*Missing observations not included are 94

Three State ED Survey

Table 6

Cross Tabulation of Respondents' Grade Level by State

	Percentage of Respondents			Total*	
	Elementary	Secondary	Other Combination of Grades	Percentage	Number
Iowa	38.0	40.7	21.3	100	324
Kansas	43.6	42.7	13.6	100	220
Nebraska	57.6	27.2	15.2	100	125
Total	43.5	38.9	17.6	100	669

*Missing cases not included are 14

Table 7

Cross Tabulation of Level of Service
Provided by Grade Level

	Percentage of Respondents			Total*	
	Elementary	Secondary	Other Combinations	Percent	Number
Resource	38.8	42.5	18.7	100	273
Self-contained	54.7	31.0	14.2	100	274
Residential	30.0	60.0	10.0	100	40
*Total	45.7	38.3	16.0	100	587

*Missing cases not included are 96

Table 8
"Emotionally Disturbed" Endorsement Status of Respondents
by Grade Level and Level of Service Provided

	Percentage of Respondents with			Total Respondents	
	Full certification for ED	Provisional certification for ED	No certification for ED	Percent	Number
*Elementary	58.0	24.2	17.7	100	231
Secondary	58.3	27.2	14.6	100	206
Other Combinations	60.4	22.9	16.7	100	96
**Resource	52.8	25.8	21.3	100	178
Self-contained	65.4	23.3	11.1	100	253
Residential	60.5	39.5	0.0	100	38
***Total	58.7	.25.0	16.3	100	535

*Missing cases not included are 150
**Missing cases not included are 214
***Missing cases not included are 148

Three State ED Survey

Table 9
Teaching Experience of Respondents

Total years of teaching Experience (all types)		N = 541	Missing = 142
Mean	6.418		
Mode	2.0		
St dev.	6.522	13% over 10 years	
Range	0-61		
Median	4.733		
Years of experience teaching ED children		N = 523	Missing = 160
Mean	2.195		
Mode	0		
St dev	2.147	9.5% over 5 years	
Range	0-8+		
Median	1.64		

Three State ED Survey

Table 10
Number of ED Students Served by Type of Program

Type of Service Delivery	At Present - This School Year		
	Number Type I ED	Number Type II ED	Total Number ED*
Resource (N = 274)	829	354	1188
Self-contained (N = 273	954	1092	2068
Residential (N = 41)	495	452	1014
Other (N = 94)	521	418	857
Total (N = 681)	2799	2316	5127

*Figures indicated reflect totals of numbers provided by respondents.

Three State ED Survey

Table 11
Number of ED Students Served by State

State	At Present - This School Year		
	Number Type I ED	Number Type II ED	Total Number ED*
Iowa (N = 325)	911	952	1773
Kansas (N = 219)	1542	1045	2690
Nebraska (N = 125)	318	251	574
Not Indicated (N = 681)	2799	2316	5127

*Figures indicated reflect totals of numbers provided by respondents.

Three State ED Survey

Table 12
Number of ED Students Served by Grade Level

Grade Level of Program	At Present - This School Year		
	Number Type I ED	Number Type II ED	Total Number ED*
Elementary (n = 293)	854	799	1678
Secondary (N = 264)	1433	1082	2507
Other Combinations (N = 120)	511	430	909
Level Missing	1	5	33
Totals (N = 681)	2799	2316	5127

*Figures indicated reflect totals of numbers provided by respondents.

Table 13
Time Spent Per Week in Various Categories of Activities

Category of Activity	Hours Spent per Week		
	N	Mean	Median
Evaluation (testing, evaluation, and classroom observation of students)	552	5.071	3.014
Teaching (Instruction, teaching, tutoring, programming, supervising of students)	550	26.049	27.643
Preparation and planning (Preparation and planning for instruction, attending staffings/meetings, maintaining records, writing IEPs, processing referrals, and attending inservice programs)	552	9.833	9.540
Consultation and Indirect Support to Student (Consultation with classroom teachers, adopting regular curriculum, developing materials, and consultation with support staff and administration	552	5.058	3.750
Other	552	1.605	0.168
Total	552	47.880	45.128

Table 14
Type of Information Available at Time of Placement

Type of Information	Percent Availability*	Rank	Mean Rating of Usefulness**	Rank
I.Q. scores and reports	92.1	1	4.736	13
Standardized achievement test scores	91.7	2	4.899	12
Clinical/psychological reports	90.4	3	5.813	2
Vision/hearing/language screening	84.2	4	5.269	9
Health history/family information	83.9	5	5.083	11
Teacher's Assessment of Behavioral Status/ anecdotal records	67.7	6	5.703	4
Criterion referenced academic evaluation/ informal tests	64.1	7	5.288	8
Statement of student's educational/behavioral goals	61.4	8	5.861	1
Subjective Evaluation (i.e. "I think it's necessary")	61.5	9	4.462	15
Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	56.4	10	5.715	3
Expected date for achieving goals	48.2	11	4.520	14
Behavior rating scales/checklists	47.9	12	5.469	6
Description of regular class expectations/ requirements	47.0	13	5.293	7
Formal behavior observation data	45.8	14	5.575	5
Sociometric/self concept data	33.2	15	5.225	10

*Number of respondents ranged from 516 to 547 on individual items.
**Number of respondents ranged from 484 to 531 on individual items.

Table 15
Usefulness of Information Available at Time of Placement

Type of Information	Mean Rating of Usefulness	Rank
Statement of student's educational/behavioral goals	5.861	1
Clinical/psychological reports	5.813	2
Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	5.715	3
Teacher's assessment of behavioral status/anectodal records	5.703	4
Formal behavior observation data	5.575	5
Behavior rating scales/checklists	5.469	6
Description of regular class expectations/requirements	5.293	7
Criterion referenced academic evaluation/informal tests	5.288	8
Vision/hearing/language screening	5.269	9
Sociometric/self-concept data	5.225	10
Health history/family information	5.083	11
Standardized achievement test scores	4.899	12
I.Q. scores and reports	4.736	13
Expected date for achieving goals	4.520	14
Subjective evaluation (i.e., "I think it's necessary")	4.462	15

Table 16
"Most" Useful Types of Information in Designing Programs

Type	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Clinical/psychological reports	273	49.9	1
Teacher's Assessment of behavioral status/anecdotal records	209	38.2	2
Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	176	32.2	3
Statement of educational/behavioral goals	138	25.2	4
Formal observation data	137	25.0	5
Criterion referenced academic evaluation/informal tests	132	24.1	6
Behavior rating scales/checklists	120	21.9	7
Standardized achievement test scores	92	16.8	8
Health history/family information	78	14.3	9
Sociometric/self concept data	77	14.1	10
I.Q. scores and reports	75	13/8	11
Description of regular class expectations/requirements	72	13.2	12
Vision/hearing/language screening	27	4.9	13
Subject[illegible]e evaluation (i.e. "He/she is ready")	20	3.7	14
Arrival of expected target date for integration	4	0.7	15
Total	1630	298.0	--

*Each of 547 respondents could indicate a maximum of three types of "most useful" information.

Table 17
Types of Information Available at the Time of Reintegration

Type of Info	Percent Available*	Rank	Mean Rating of Usefullness**	Rank
Achievement of behavioral/academic goals	94.7	1	6.105	1
I.Q. scores and reports	94.5	2	4.313	15
Clinical/psychological reports	94.1	3	5.067	11
Teacher's assessment of behavioral status	93.0	4	6.056	2
Standardized achievement test scores	91.1	5	4.740	13
Vision/hearing/language screening	90.6	6	4.909	12
Subjective evaluation ("readiness")	90.3	7	5.646	5
Health history/family information	89.7	8	4.624	14
Statement of interventions attempted	87.9	9	5.893	4
Criterion referenced academic information	84.7	10	5.308	8
Arrival of expected date for achievement of. goals	79.4	11	5.114	10
Description of regular class expectation/requirements	74.1	12	6.049	3
Formal observation Data	68.5	13	5.548	6
Behavioral ratings/checklists	67.3	14	5.513	7
Sociometric/self concept data	53.7	15	5.122	9

*Number of respondents ranged from 456 to 473 on individual items.
**Number of reponsdents ranged from 425 to 455 on individual items.

Table 18
Usefulness of Information at Time of Reintegration

Type of Information	Mean Rating of Usefulness	Rank
Achievement of behavioral/academic goals	6.105	1
Teacher's assessment of behavioral status	6.056	2
Description of regular class expectations/requirements	6.049	3
Statement of intervention attempted	5.893	4
Subjective evaluation ("readiness")	5.646	5
Formal observation data	5.548	6
Behavioral ratings/checklists	5.513	7
Criterion referenced academic information	5.308	8
Sociometric/self concept data	5.122	9
Arrival of expected date for achievement of goals	5.114	10
Clinical/psychological reports	5.067	11
Vision/hearing/language screening	4.909	12
Standardized achievement test scores	4.740	13
Health history/family information	4.624	14
I.Q. scores and reports	4.313	15

Table 19
"Most Useful" Types of Information in Integration Decision

Type of Information	Frequency*	Percentage	Rank
Achievement of educational/behavioral goals	275	53.0	1
Your assessment of behavioral status/anectotal records	253	52.2	2
Description of regular classroom expectations/requirements	224	46.2	3
Subjective evaluation ("He/she is ready")	144	29.7	4
Behavior rating scales/checklists	97	20.0	5
Statement of intervention techniques attempted	95	19.6	6
Clinical/psychological reports	82	16.9	7
Formal behavior observation data	80	16.5	8
Criterion referenced evaluation/informal tests	79	16.3	9
Sociometric/self concept data	37	7.6	10
Standardized achievement test scores	37	7.6	10
Arrival of expected target date for integration	21	4.3	12
I.Q. scores and reports	21	4.3	12
Health history/family information	16	3.3	14
Vision/hearing/language screening	7	1.4	15
Total	1450	299.0%	

*Each of 485 respondents could indicate a maximum of three types of "Most Useful" Information.

Table 20
t Tests for Ratings of Usefulnesss at Placement and at Reintegration

Type of Information	Mean Rating at Placement	Mean Rating at Reintegration	t value*	Probability
I.Q. scores and reports	4.7506	4.3181	6.15	0.000**
Clinical/psychological reports	5.8532	5.0482	11.84	0.000**
Standardized achievement test scores	4.9883	4.7336	3.50	0.000**
Criterion referenced academic evaluations/informal tests	5.3173	5.3341	-0.26	0.793
Behavior rating scales/checklist	5.5232	5.5257	0.04	0.971
Formal observation data	5.6288	5.5808	0.80	0.426
Teacher's assessment of behavioral status/anecdotal records	5.7530	6.0665	-5.44	0.000**
Sociometric/self concept data	5.2267	5.1511	1.22	0.223
Health history/family information	5.1682	4.6185	8.32	0.000**
Vision/hearing/language screening	5.2770	4.9202	6.08	0.000**
Description of regular classroom expectations/requirements	5.3060	6.0747	-11.17	0.000**
Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	5.9033	5.9198	-0.29	0.768
Statement of student's educational/ behavioral goals	5.7667	6.1357	-6.15	0.000**
Expected date for achieving goals	4.5856	5.1538	-7.12	0.000**
Subjective evaluation	4.5327	5.6344	-14.67	0.000**

*Number of respondents to both questions ranged from 396 to 437 on individual items.
**Statistically significant.

Table 21
Availability of Choices of Teachers/Classrooms in Which
to Integrate ED Students by State, Level of Service, and Grade Level

"Is there typically a choice of teachers/classrooms in which to integrate a particular ED student?"

	Percent Yes	Percent No	Total Percent	Total Number
*Iowa	38.0	40.7	100	236
Kansas	68.3	31.7	100	180
Nebraska	78.0	22.0	100	82
**Resource	68.1	31.9	100	166
Self-contained	83.4	16.6	100	241
Residential	50.0	50.0	100	34
***Elementary	73.1	26.9	100	216
Secondary	77.2	22.8	100	197
Other Combinations	68.1	31.9	100	91
****Total	73.8	26.2	100	507

*Missing cases not included are 185
**Missing cases not included are 242
***Missing cases not included are 179
****Missing cases not included are 176

Table 22
Teacher Factors in Selecting Site for
Student Integration

Teacher Factors	Mean Rating	Rank
Attitude toward behavioral problems	6.557	1
Behavioral expectations	6.369	2
Willingness to modify curriculum	6.335	3
Attitude toward integraton	6.333	4
Rapport with this student	6.172	5
Rapport with other students	5.948	6
Previous success with integration	5.926	7
Academic expectations	5.844	8
Personality	5.831	9
Knowledge of E.D. students	5.727	10
Proficiency in behavior management	5.587	11
Relationship with you	4.987	12
Training to integrate	4.905	13

Number of respondents ranged from 398 to 406 on items.

Table 23
Classroom Factors in Selecting Site
for Student Integration

Classroom Factors	Mean Rating*	Rank
Degree of classroom structure	6.322	1
Level of curriculum/materials	5.955	2
Range of student behaviors in class	5.911	3
Number of students in class	5.688	4
Behavior management systems	5.578	5
Number of other integrated students	5.510	6
Range of academic functioning levels	5.481	7
Availability of aides/volunteers	4.424	8
Location and convenience	3.758	9

*Number of respondents ranged from 396 to 405 on items.

Table 24
Importance of Factors in Selecting a
Site for Integration of Students

Teacher and Classroom Factors	Mean Rating	Rank
Teacher's attitude toward behavior problems	6.557	1
Teacher's behavioral expectations	6.369	2
Teacher's willingness to modify curriculum	6.335	3
Teacher's attitude toward integration	6.333	4
Degree of classroom structure	6.322	5
Teacher's rapport with this student	6.172	6
Level of curriculum/materials	5.955	7
Teacher's rapport with other students	5.948	8
Teacher's previous success with integration	5.926	9
Range of student behaviors in class	5.911	10
Teacher's personality	5.831	11
Teacher's academic expectations	5.844	12
Teacher's knowledge of E.D. students	5.727	13
Teacher's proficiency in behavior management	5.857	14
Number of students in class	5.688	15
Behavior management systems	5.578	16
Number of other integrated students	5.510	17
Range of academic functioning level	5.481	18
Teacher's relationship with you	4.987	19
Teacher's training to integrate students	4.905	20
Availability of aides/volunteers	4.424	21
Location and convenience	3.758	22

Table 25
"Most Important" Factors in Choosing a Site for Reintegration

Factor	Frequency*	Percentage	Rank
Teacher's attitude toward behavior problems	172	39.7	1
Teacher's willingness/skills to modify curriculum	157	36.3	2
Teacher's attitude integration	151	34.9	3
Teacher's behavioral expectations	133	30.7	4
Teacher's rapport with this particular student	93	21.5	5
Degree of classroom structure	81	18.7	6
Teacher's academic expectations	52	12.0	7
Teacher's proficiency in use of behavioral management techniques	52	12.0	7
Level of curriculum and materials	52	12.0	7
Teacher's previous success with integrated students	47	10.9	8
Numbe of students in class	46	10.6	9
Teacher's knowledge of ED students	43	9.9	10
Teacher's personality	40	9.2	11
Teacher's rapport with other students	31	7.2	12
Range of student behaviors in class	25	5.8	13
Behavior management systems	21	4.8	14
Range of student academic functioning level	21	4.8	14
Teacher's training to integrate students	20	4.6	15
Teacher's relationship with you	14	3.2	16
Number of other integrated students in class	11	2.5	17
Availability of aides/volunteers	1	0.2	18
Location and convenience of the classroom	1	0.2	18
Other	27	6.3	-
Totals	1291	298.2	

*Each of 433 respondents could indicate a maximum of three factors as "most important".

Table 26
Training Related to Reintegration

Questionnaire Item	Percentage of Respondents Answering				
	Don't Know	None	One Session	2-5 Sessions	6 or more Sessions
Amount of training provided to building staff regarding integration of handicapped students N = 544	25.4	33.8	14.2	21.3	5.3
Amount of training provided specifically to regular class teachers who will be receiving integrated students N = 546	30.2	39.6	11.7	14.3	4.2
Amount of training respondent received regarding reintegration of students into regular program N = 547	2.4	25.4	11.0	26.3	34.9
Amount of training respondent received regarding provision of consultant to classroom teachers and indirect support of integrated students N = 539	3.5	31.2	11.3	21.5	32.5

Table 27
Planning and Responsibility for Reintegration

Questions	Responses
Is the amount of time a student spends in a regular classroom program specified on each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP)? N = 545	Yes: 78.0% / No: 16.2% / Uncertain: 5.8%
For those ED students who have been successfully integrated on a full-time basis, estimate the average length of time such students were served before they were integrated full-time? N = 457	4.8% - 3 months or less 6.1% - 3-6 months 9.0% - 6-9 months 8.3% - 9-12 months 6.1% - 12-15 months 5.7% - 15-18 months 10.1% - More than 18 months 49.9% - None/not applicable
Is there typically a choice of teachers and/or classrooms in which to integrate a particular ED student? N = 507	Yes: 73.8% / No: 26.2%
Are the Teacher/classroom characteristics of possible sites for integration typically discussed at the staff meeting in which the integration decision is made? N = 526	Yes: 76.4% / No: 23.6%
Is responsibility for coordinating reintegration efforts for a particular student assigned to one professional person? N = 536	Assigned: 52.4% / Not Assigned: 31.7% / Don't Know: 15.9%
What person is typically or most often assigned responsibility for coordinating reintegration of students? N = 515	37.9% - ED Teacher 14.4% - Resource Teacher 11.7% - ED Consultant or Supervisor 6.8% - Psychologist 8.2% - Principal 13.8% - Other 7.4% - None Assigned

Table 28
Procedures for Reintegration

Questions	Responses
Procedures for integration of students from your program into the regular classroom are: N = 536	27.1% - Written 45.1% - Not written, but established and understood 27.8% - Not established at this time

If procedures for integration are established for your program, indicate which of the following are components of these guidelines:	Percentage of respondents: Is a Component	Is not a Component	Not Applicable
a. Description of needed placement information: N = 376	75.5%	15.4%	9.0%
b. Delineation of responsibilities of each integration team member (including the regular classroom teacher(s): N = 378	61.6%	28.0%	10.3%
c. Criteria for determining readiness of the student: N = 381	77.7%	16.0%	6.3%
d. Criteria for selection of the regular class teacher(s) and classroom(s): N = 375	54.1%	30.7%	15.2%
e. Criteria for determining the success reintegration efforts:	66.5%	25.7%	7.9%
f. Follow-up procedures: N = 382	73.6%	20.2%	6.3%

If procedures for integration are established for your program, are these procedures typically followed? N = 683	Yes	Sometimes	No	Unsure	Not Applicable
	32.5%	15.1%	0.6%	3.5%	48.3%

Table 29
Type of Student Progress Important
to Reintegration

	Importance			
	Most	Moderate	Least	Total
Academic Progress	9.9%	32.2%	57.9%	100%
Behavior In Your Program	53.3%	30.8%	15.9%	100%
Behavior Out of Your Program	40.0%	37.6%	22.3%	100%

Total number of respondents = 497

Table 30
Activities Where Reintegration Most Often Occurs

For ED students currently integrated into regular programs on a part-time basis, in which areas does integration most often occur? Rank each.	Percent of Respondents Ranking this item as	
	Most often occurring	Least often occurring
Academic Instruction (reading, language, math, science, etc.) N = 458	20.5	56.1
Nonacademic instruction (music, art, shop, P.E., etc.) N = 462	45.0	5.0
Non-instructional activities (recess, lunch, study hall, etc.) N = 446	45.7	32.3

Table 31
Follow-up for Reintegration

Questions	Responses	
If follow-up of integration occurs, which methods are typically used:	Used	Not used
a. Verbal report from the regular teacher(s), principals, etc. N = 474	97.3	2.7
b. Written report or checklist from the regular teacher(s) N = 443	57.1	42.9
c. Direct observation of student by someone other than the classroom teacher(s) N = 444	50.7	49.3
If followup procedures are used, which is the closest to the frequency with which the follow-up typically occurs? N = 458	63.8% - weekly 20.7% - monthly 10.9% - quarterly 3.1% - each semester 1.5% - yearly	

A SURVEY ON THE

REINTEGRATION OF EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED STUDENTS

Office Use	
Card 1	1
I.D. _____	2-5

School district or agency where classroom is located: _____

School building name: _____ School district #: _____ 6-9

1. Under your state, circle the number next to the type of classroom you operate: 10-11

IOWA	KANSAS	NEBRASKA
11 ED Severe Self-Contained Residential (Weighted 4.0)	21 PSA Self-Contained Residential	31 ED Self-Contained Residential (Level 3)
12 ED Severe Self-Contained Public School (Weighted 4.0)	22 PSA Self-Contained Public School	32 ED Self-Contained Public School (Level 2)
13 ED Self-Contained Public School (Weighted 2.0)	23 PSA Departmental Program	33 Self-Contained and Resource (Levels 1 & 2)
14 ED Special Class with Integration (Weighted 1.7)	24 Resource Program	34 Resource Program (Level 1)
15 ED Resource Program - ED Students Only	25 Itinerant teacher	35 Other (specify) _____
16 Multi-disability Resource	26 Consulting teacher	
17 Other (specify) _____	27 Interrelated Program	
	28 Other (specify) ____	

2. Indicate the grade placement range of students in your program: 12

1. Elementary (grades K-6) 2. Secondary (grades 7-12) 3. Other (specify) _____

3. Indicate the total number of full years of teaching experience (all types) you have completed prior to the 1979-1980 school year: 13-14

_____ years

4. Indicate the total number of full years of teaching experience <u>in an ED program</u> you have completed prior to the 1979-1980 school year: 15

_____ years

5. Indicate your present teaching endorsement status related to <u>emotional disturbance</u>: 16

1. Full certification for ED 2. Provisional certification for ED 3. No certification for ED

6. Indicate the total number of students labeled as ED served by your program: 17-20

a. At present - this school year: _____ b. Last year - during the 1978-79 school year: _____

<u>NOTE</u>: If both a. and b. above are zero (none), <u>stop here</u> and return this form as directed.

7. Indicate the total number of all other handicapped students (not ED) served by your program: 21-24

a. At present - this school year: _____ b. Last year - during the 1978-79 school year: _____

8. Students who are labeled as emotionally disturbed have been classified into two groups:

<u>TYPE I</u> ED students are those who may be considered as conduct or behavior disordered; they present behavior problems in some settings but not in others.

<u>TYPE II</u> ED students are those who may be considered "truly" emotionally disturbed; they present behavior problems in all settings.

Use your best judgment to indicate the number of each type of ED student in your program:

a. At present - this school year: Type I: _____ Type II: _____ 25-28

b. Last year - during the 1978-79 school year: Type I: _____ Type II: _____ 29-32

9. For the categories of students above, indicate how many Type I ED, Type II ED, and other handicapped students achieved and maintained the following degrees of integration:

	At present - this school year			Last year - during the 1978-79 school year (include those whose status changed over the summer of '79)			
Degree of integration	Type I	Type II	Other	Type I	Type II	Other	
Integrated full-time (100%) into regular programs	____	____	____	____	____	____	33-44
Integrated 51-99% of time into regular programs	____	____	____	____	____	____	45-56
Integrated 1-50% of time into regular programs	____	____	____	____	____	____	57-68
Not integrated (0%) into							

Office Use
Card 2 1
I.D. ____ 2-5

10. Indicate the numbers of ED students whose status officially changed in the following ways:

Status	At present - this school year	Last year - during the 1978-79 school year (include those whose status changed over summer '79	
De-labeled, removed from program & placed in regular programs	____	____	6-9
Placed in a less restrictive ED program	____	____	10-13
Placed in a more restrictive ED program	____	____	14-17
Placed in some other category of special education program	____	____	18-21
Suspended or expelled	____	____	22-25
Withdrawn, dropped out of school, or moved	____	____	26-29
Graduated or advanced to next grade level of programs	____	____	30-33

11. For all of those ED students who have been successfully integrated on a full-time basis, estimate the average length of time such students were served before they were integrated full-time.

1. None/Not applicable 2. 3 months or less 3. 3-6 months 4. 6-9 months 5. 9-12 months
6. 12-15 months 7. 15-18 months 8. More than 18 months 34

12. For ED students currently integrated into regular programs on a part-time basis, in which areas does integration most often occur? Rank each from "1" Most Often Occurring to "3" Least Often Occurring.

Academic instruction (reading, language, math, science, etc.) ____ 35
Nonacademic instruction (mustic, art, shop, P.E., etc.) ____ 36
Noninstructional activities (recess, lunch, study hall, etc.) ____ 37

13. What amount of training has been provided to the staff of your building concerning the integration of handicapped students?

1. Don't Know 2. None (0) 3. One Session 4. Two to Five Sessions 5. More Than Five Sessions 38

14. What amount of special training has been provided specifically to regular class teachers who will be receiving integrated students?

1. Don't Know 2. None (0) 3. One Session 4. Two to Five Sessions 5. More Than Five Sessions 39

15. What amount of training (from any source) regarding reintegrating students into regular programs had you received?

1. Don't Know 2. None (0) 3. One Session 4. Two to Five Sessions 5. More Than Five Sessions 40

16. What amount of training to provide consultation to classroom teachers and indirect support to students have you received?

1. Don't Know 2. None (0) 3. One Session 4. Two to Five Sessions 5. More than Five Sessions 41

17. Is the amount of time a student spends in a regular classroom program specified on each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP)?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Uncertain 42

18. Are teacher/classroom characteristics of possible sites for integration typically discussed at the staff meeting in which the integration decision is made?

1. Yes 2. No 43

19. During a typical week, indicate the approximate number of hours you spend performing each of the categories of activities below. Be sure to include any time spent before or after your required school hours.

A. Evaluation . . . . . ____ hours 44-45
(Testing, evaluation, and classroom observation of students)

B. Teaching . . . . . ____ hours 46-47
(Instruction, teaching, tutoring, programming, supervising of students)

C. Preparation and Planning . . . . . ____ hours 48-49
(Preparation and planning for instruction, attending staffings/ meetings, maintaining records, writing IEPs, processing referrals, and attending inservice programs)

D. Consultation and indirect support to student . . . . . ____ hours 50-51
(Consultation with classroom teachers, adapting regular curriculum, developing materials, and consultation with support staff and administration)

E. Other (specify) _____ ____ hours 52-53

Office Use
Card 3 1
I.D. _____ 2-5

20. Which of the following types of information are typically available at the time an ED student is placed into your program. Also rate its usefulness in designing and implementing an appropriate program.

Type of information	Availability at time of placement		Usefulness in designing/implementing a special program							
	Available	Not Available	Unimportant						Essential	
01. I.Q. Scores and reports	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6-7
02. Clinical/psychological reports	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8-9
03. Standardized achievement test scores	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10-11
04. Criterion referenced academic evaluation/informal tests	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12-13
05. Behavior rating scales/checklists	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	14-15
06. Formal behavior observation data	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	16-17
07. Teacher's assessment of behavioral status/anecdotal records	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	18-19
08. Sociometric/self-concept data	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	20-21
09. Health history family information	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	22-23
10. Vision/hearing/language screening	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	24-25
11. Description of regular classroom expectations/requirements	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	26-27
12. Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	28-29
13. Statement of student's educational behavioral goals	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	30-31
14. Expected date for achieving goals	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	32-33
15. Subjective evaluation, i.e., "I think it's necessary."	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	34-35

21. From the list of fifteen above, please write the numbers of the three which are typically the most useful types of information in designing/implementing a special program for ED students:

a. ____ b. ____ c. ____ 36-41

22. Is responsibility for coordinating reintegration efforts for a particular student assigned to one professional person?

1. Assigned 2. Not assigned 3. Don't Know 42

23. What one person typically or most often is assigned responsibility for coordinating reintegration of students (i.e., contacting the home school, arranging transportation, scheduling, follow-up, etc.)?

1. ED teacher 2. Resource teacher 3. ED consultant or supervisor 4. Psychologist
5. Principal 6. Other (specify) _____ 7. None typically assigned 43

24. Procedures for integration of students from your program into the regular classroom are:

1. Written 2. Not written, but established and understood 3. Not established at this time 44

25. If procedures for integration are established for your program (#1 or #2 circled immediately above), indicate which of the following are components of these guidelines:

Description of needed placement information	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	45
Delineation of responsibilities of each integration team member (including the regular classroom teacher(s))	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	46
Criteria for determining readiness of the student	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	47
Criteria for selection of the regular class teacher(s) and classroom(s)	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	48
Criteria for determining the success of integration efforts	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	49
Follow-up procedures	1. N.A. 2. Is 3. Is Not	50

26. If procedures for integration are established for your program, are these procedures typically followed?

0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No 4. Unsure 51

(Continue on next page)

Office Use	
Card 4	1
I.D. _____	2-5

27. Which of the following types of information are typically available at the time a decision is made to integrate an ED student from your program into the regular classroom. Please also rate the usefulness of this information in making a decision to integrate an ED student.

Types of Information	Availability at time of integration decision		Usefulness in making a decision to integrate an ED student							
	Available	Not Available	Unimportant						Essential	
01. I.Q. scores and reports	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6-7
02. Clinical/psychological reports	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8-9
03. Standardized achievement test scores	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10-11
04. Criterion referenced academic evaluation/informal tests	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12-13
05. Behavior rating scales/checklists	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	14-15
06. Formal behavior observation data	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	16-17
07. Your assessment of behavioral status/anecdotal records	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	18-19
08. Sociometric/self-concept data	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	20-21
09. Health history/family information	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	22-23
10. Vision/hearing/language screening	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	24-25
11. Description of regular classroom expectations/requirements	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	26-27
12. Statement of intervention techniques already attempted	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	28-29
13. Achievement of educational/ behavioral goals	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	30-31
14. Arrival of expected target date for integration	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	32-33
15. Subjective evaluation, i.e., "I think he/she is ready."	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	34-35

28. From the list of fifteen above, please write the numbers of the three which are typically the most useful types of information in deciding whether to integrate an ED student:

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ 36-41

29. When a decision is being considered whether to integrate an ED student into a regular program which type of student progress is typically most important? Rank each from "1" most important to "3" least important.

academic progress _____ 42

behavioral/social progress in your program _____ 43

behavioral/social progress outside of your program _____ 44

(Continue on reverse)

Card 4 *Office Use (continued)*

30. Is there typically a choice of teachers and/or classrooms in which to integrate a particular ED student? 1. Yes 2. No *45*

If yes, please rate the relative importance of the following factors in choosing a site for student integration:

	Unimportant						Essential	
Teacher Factors								
01. Teacher's academic expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*46*
02. Teacher's behavioral expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*47*
03. Teacher's knowledge of ED students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*48*
04. Teacher's attitude toward behavior problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*49*
05. Teacher's training to integrate students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*50*
06. Teacher's attitude toward integration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*51*
07. Teacher's previous success with integrated students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*52*
08. Teacher's rapport with this particular student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*53*
09. Teacher's rapport with other students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*54*
10. Teacher's willingness/skills to modify curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*55*
11. Teacher's proficiency in the use of behavior management techniques	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*56*
12. Teacher's personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*57*
13. Teacher's relationship with you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*58*
14. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*59*
Classroom Factors								
15. Number of students in the class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*60*
16. Number of other integrated students in class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*61*
17. Level of curriculum and materials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*62*
18. Degree of classroom structure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*63*
19. Behavior management systems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*64*
20. Range of student academic functioning level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*65*
21. Range of student behaviors in class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*66*
22. Apparent empathy/tolerance level of students	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	*67*
23. Availability of aides/volunteers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*68*
24. Location and convenience of the classroom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*69*
25. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*70*

31. From the list of teacher and classroom factors above, please write in order the numbers of the three most important factors in choosing a site for ED student integration:

1st: ____, 2nd: ____, and 3rd: ____ *71-76*

32. If follow-up of integration occurs, which methods are typically used:

Verbal report from the regular teacher(s), principal, etc. 1. Used 2. Not used *77*

Written report or checklist from the regular teacher(s) 1. Used 2. Not used *78*

Direct observation of student by someone other than the classroom teacher(s) 1. Used 2. Not used *79*

33. If follow-up procedures are used, which is the closest to the frequency with which the follow-up typically occurs?

1. Weekly 2. Monthly 3. Quarterly 4. Each Semester 5. Yearly *80*

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please return this form promptly!